

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/628,545	07/28/2003	Yasunao Okazaki	5077-045/COC	3593
27572	7590 03/11/2004	÷	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			GLENN, KIMBERLY E	
P.O. BOX 82 BLOOMFIE	28 LD HILLS, MI 48303		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2817	
			DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	r	<u> </u>	L			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-			
Office Action Summany	10/628,545	OKAZAKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kimberly E Glenn	2817				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communi D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 8-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 8-11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•		• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	e			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/28/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2817

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 7/28/03 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because copies of the foreign patent documents and other documents were not included. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2817

Claims 8-11 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8, 10 and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,642,815. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because The patent disclose a dielectric resonator filter comprising a dielectric resonator, an enclosure, a resonance tuning means and a divided ring for suppressing propagation of a spurious electromagnetic filed mode.

Thus the patent is shown to teach all the limitation of the claims the present application with the exception of thread nut for suppressing the propagation of spurious electromagnetic field mode.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute a hexagon or polygon threaded nut for the divided ring. The motivation for this modification would have been to provide an obvious variation.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Collinet et al US Patent 4,477,788
- Satoh et al US Patent 6,414,572
- Wakino et al US Patent 4.028.652

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly E Glenn whose telephone number is (571)-272-1761. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30 to 4:00.

Art Unit: 2817

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on (571)-272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Kimberly E Glenn Examiner Art Unit 2817

keg

Pobert Pascal

Supervisory Parant Examiner Technology Center 2800